arXiv:1701.00415v1 [astro-ph.GA] 2 Jan 2017

A universal minimal mass scale for present-day central black holes

Tal Alexander[1] and Ben Bar-Or[2]

[1] Department of Particle Physics & Astrophysics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel.

[2] Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

Abstract

Intermediate mass black holes (BHs) with masses in the range $M_\bullet \sim 10^2$–$10^5\,M_\odot$ are the long-sought missing link[1] between stellar mass BHs born of supernovae, and supermassive BHs, which are tied to large-scale galactic evolution, as suggested by the yet unexplained empirical M/σ correlation between the central BH's mass and the stellar velocity dispersion of the host galaxy's bulge[2, 3], $M_\bullet(\sigma_\star) = M_s(\sigma_\star/\sigma_s)^\beta$. We show that low-mass BH seeds that grow by accreting stars in galactic nuclei that follow a universal M/σ relation[4, 5], all grow over the age of the universe above a present-day mass scale $\mathcal{M}_0 \sim 2\times10^5\,M_\odot$ (5% lower C.L.), independently of the unknown initial seed mass and its formation process. $\mathcal{M}_0$ depends only weakly on the uncertainties in the BH formation redshift, and provides a universal minimal mass scale for BHs that grow also by gas accretion or mergers. This can explain why no intermediate mass BHs with mass $M_\bullet < \mathcal{M}_0$ were found to date[6], and implies that present day galaxies with velocity dispersion $\sigma_\star < \mathcal{S}_0 = \sigma_s(\mathcal{M}_0/M_s)^{1/\beta} \sim 35\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}$ (5% lower C.L.) do not have a central BH, or formed their seed BH only recently. A dearth of BHs with mass below $\mathcal{M}_0$ has observable implications for the nature and rates of tidal disruption of stars by central BHs[7] and for gravitational wave (GW) sources from BH–BH mergers and the inspiral of compact stellar remnants into BHs in galactic nuclei[8].

The existence of BHs with mass $M_\bullet < 100\,M_\odot$ is now confirmed by the detection of gravitational waves (GW) from stellar mass BH-BH mergers[9]. Massive black holes (MBHs) with $M_\bullet \gtrsim 10^6\,M_\bullet$ are detected in galactic nuclei by a variety of methods[6], and are often observed as luminous active galactic nuclei (AGN). The theoretical interest and observational quest for intermediate mass BHs (IMBHs) has been going on for many decades now[10], starting soon after the identification of quasars as accreting MBHs[11]. However, there are no definite detections of IMBHs to date[6]. Although it is harder to detect the low

mass IMBHs[12], the continuing absence of firm evidence for their existence is increasingly puzzling.

Observations indicate that AGN acquire most of their mass by luminous accretion of gas[13, 14] in apparent correlation with cosmic star formation history from at least redshift[15] $z \sim 3$. The existence of very high-redshift quasars[16] implies that rapid BH growth and luminous accretion can occur very soon after the Big Bang. The early stages of MBH evolution are poorly understood, and in particular the formation processes and masses of the initial BH seeds remain unknown[17]. Suggested formation mechanisms typically rely on the extreme conditions in the early universe (e.g. very low metallicity, very high gas or star density), and lead to rapid BH seed formation. It is therefore plausible that the seeds of present-day central BHs were formed at least a Hubble time ago ($z > 1.8$ for a look-back time of $t_H = 10$ Gyr[a]).

The M/σ relation that is observed in the local universe over $\gtrsim 3$ decades in MBH mass, reveals a tight correlation between $M_\bullet$ and the stellar velocity dispersion $\sigma_\star$ of the host galaxy's bulge, well outside the MBH's radius of direct dynamical influence[6], $r_h \sim GM_\bullet/\sigma_\star^2$. This suggests an evolutionary link between the growth of the central BH and its galaxy. Recent analyses of large heterogeneous samples of MBHs and their host galaxies find that a universal M/σ relation[b] holds for all galaxy types[4, 5], although the scope of this relation and its evolution with redshift remain controversial[15]. We assume here this universal M/σ holds at all redshifts[19]. By fixing r_h, the M/σ relation imposes tight connections between the MBH mass and the dynamical properties of its immediate stellar surroundings[20], and specifically the rate at which it consumes stars (see Appendix).

A central BH grows by (1) The accretion of stars, compact remnants and dark matter particles that are deflected toward it on nearly radial orbits. These either cross directly the event horizon if they are dense enough, or else are first tidally disrupted, and then part of the debris is accreted on the BH[7]. (2) The accretion of unbound gas from the interstellar medium, which must first lose almost all of its angular momentum by viscous processes to circularize down to the innermost stable circular orbit and fall through the event horizon. (3) A merger with another BH, by the formation of a binary system that initially decays dynamically and finally decays by the emission of GWs.

Of these three growth channels, only the accretion of stars is an unavoidable consequence of the existence of a central BH in a stellar system. Furthermore, the stellar tidal disruption event (TDE) rate in steady state can be estimated from first principles, for given boundary conditions[21, 22]. It has been noticed early on that the natural scale for the steady state TDE rate on low-mass IMBHs/MBHs ($M_\bullet < 10^6\,M_\bullet$), $\Gamma \sim 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (see appendix) implies that these may acquire a substantial fraction of their mass from TDEs, and that this also implies, in the linear growth approximation, a natural BH mass scale,

[a] For the concordance cosmological model[18]: $h = 0.696$, $\Omega_{=}0.286$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.714$.

[b] Here we adopt the empirical fit[5] $M_\bullet = 10^{8.32\pm0.04\pm\epsilon}(\sigma_\star/200\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}})^{(5.35\pm0.23)}\,M_\odot$, where $\epsilon = 0.49 \pm 0.03$ is the intrinsic scatter.

$M_\bullet^{\rm TDE} \sim \Gamma t_H \sim 10^6\, M_\bullet$[23, 24]. However, previous studies typically focused on the rates and prospects of TDE detection, and not on long-term BH growth. Although it was recently argued that $M_\bullet^{\rm TDE}$ arises as a minimal BH mass in a specific formation model[25], the commonly held assumption remains that IMBHs with $M_\bullet \ll M_\bullet^{\rm TDE}$ do exist, and therefore this constrains the formation scenarios, or sets an upper bound on the efficiency of TDE accretion, rather than a lower bound on the mass of IMBHs[26].

Here we derive a universal lower bound on the present-day mass scale of MBHs, $\mathcal{M}_0$, that is independent of the unknown initial seed mass and its formation process. We argue that quasi-steady state around a low-mass BH is a plausible and self-consistent assumption, and apply the empirical M/σ relation to set the boundary conditions. We then show that the exact non-linear BH growth equation can be bound from below by a simple inequality that includes only growth by TDEs, and derive the universal lower mass bound $\mathcal{M}_0 \sim$ few $\times\, 10^5\, M_\odot$. Intriguingly, $\mathcal{M}_0$ is just below the lowest-mass MBHs discovered to date[6], $\min(M_\bullet) \lesssim 10^6\, M_\odot$.

Stars around a central BH are constantly scattered in angular momentum to nearly radial orbits below a critical ("loss-cone") value, $j_{lc} = \sqrt{1-e^2}$ (e is the orbital eccentricity), that takes them closer to the BH than the tidal disruption radius, $r_t \simeq Q^{1/3} R_\star$, where they are destroyed ($Q = M_\bullet/M_\star$ is the BH to star mass ratio, $R_\star$ is the stellar radius). The tidal radius for a typical, Solar type star is outside the BH's event horizon for $M_\bullet < 10^8\, M_\odot$. Such stars are therefore first disrupted by an IMBH, rather than swallowed whole. Only a fraction $f_a \sim 1/4$–$1/2$ of their mass is then accreted by the BH[27]. The TDE rate of stars originating at a distance r from the BH depends on the number of stars there, and on the competition between the 2-body relaxation time and the orbital time in supplying and draining loss-cone orbits. In steady state, the integrated contribution from all radii is a function of $M_\bullet$ and the boundary conditions at r_h, fixed by $\sigma_\star$. The TDE rate (see Appendix) is well-approximated by two simple power-laws $\Gamma \simeq \Gamma_\star Q^{b(\beta)}$ (Eqs A-13, A-19) whose index changes across a critical BH mass $M_c \sim 10^6\, M_\odot$. Generally, the dynamics leading to tidal disruption are dominated by stars originating from $\sim r_h(M_\bullet)$ for $M_\bullet \geq M_c$, and by stars originating from a critical radius $r_c(M_\bullet) < r_h(M_\bullet)$ for $M_\bullet < M_c$[21] (see appendix). For the empirically-determined range of the M/σ relation index[6, 15], $4 \lesssim \beta < 6$, the power-law index is always $b \ll 1$.

Assume that a BH seed is formed in a stellar system of mass $M_{\rm sys}$ with a large enough initial mass M_i to dominate its radius of influence, $M_\star \ll M_i \ll \min(M_\bullet) \ll M_{\rm sys}$. Consider first the case where the BH grows only by the accretion of stars. The BH growth equation is then

$$\dot{Q} = f_a \Gamma_\star Q^b\,, \quad Q\,(0) = Q_i = M_i/M_\star\,, \tag{1}$$

and its solution is

$$Q(t) = \begin{cases} [{Q_i}^{1-b} + (1-b)t/t_a]^{1/(1-b)} & b \neq 1 \\ Q_i e^{t/t_a} & b = 1 \end{cases}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $t_a = (f_a \Gamma_\star)^{-1}$ is the accretion timescale. The growth solution has three branches. The solution for $b = 1$ is exponential, which diverges to infinity in infinite time. When $b > 1$, Q diverges on a finite timescale,

$$t_\infty = t_a Q_i^{1-b} / |1-b| \,, \tag{3}$$

and is supra-exponential. The $b \geq 1$ solutions are functions of the initial BH seed mass Q_i on all timescales. Exponential growth describes radiation pressure-regulated accretion of gas at the Eddington limit. Supra-exponential growth describes Hoyle-Lyttleton wind accretion[28], spherical Bondi accretion[29], or their generalization of accretion on an accelerating BH[30].

In contrast, when $b < 1$, which is the relevant case for the M/σ relation, Q grows sub-exponentially and asymptotes at $t \gg t_\infty$ to a power law that is independent of initial seed mass Q_i

$$Q(t) \simeq [(1-b)t/t_a]^{1/(1-b)} \,. \tag{4}$$

Since $t_\infty \ll t_H$ for BH seeds with mass $M_\bullet \lesssim 10^5\, M_\odot$ (Eq. 3), all BH seeds reach the same present-day mass after $t \sim \mathcal{O}(t_H)$ (Figure 1).

Consider next the realistic case where the BH grows in parallel by the typically dominant channels of gas accretion and/or mergers, $\dot{Q} = \dot{Q}_\star + \dot{Q}_+$, where $\dot{Q}_\star = f_a \Gamma_\star Q^b$ (Eq.1) is the mass accreted from stars, and $\dot{Q}_+ \geq 0$ is the mass accreted from the other channels. The full growth equation is then

$$\dot{Q} = \dot{Q}_\star + \dot{Q}_+ \geq f_a \Gamma_\star Q^b \,, \quad Q(0) = Q_i \,. \tag{5}$$

The solution of the stars-only growth Eq. (1) then provides a *lower limit* on the actual mass $Q(t)$ of the growing BH[c]. The universal minimal mass scale of central BHs at t_H, and the corresponding minimal velocity dispersion scale are then (Eq. 4)

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = [(1-b) f_a \Gamma_\star t_H]^{1/(1-b)}\, M_\star \,, \quad \mathcal{S}_0 = (\mathcal{M}_0/M_s)^{1/\beta} \sigma_s \,, \tag{6}$$

with the index b for the $M_\bullet < M_c$ branch of Eq. (A-14). Galaxies with $\sigma_\star < \mathcal{S}_0$ do not have a central BH, or have formed it only recently, for otherwise the co-evolution of the BH and nucleus over t_H would have driven $\sigma_\star$ to a much larger present-day value.

$\mathcal{M}_0$ increases with the power-law index α of the stellar cusp around the BH ($n_\star \propto r^{-\alpha}$) and with the accreted mass fraction f_a. Assuming Solar type stars, $\mathcal{M}_0$ extends over the relevant range in α and f_a from $1.2 \times 10^5\, M_\odot$ for the shallowest possible cusp of unbound stars and a low accreted mass fraction ($\alpha = 1/2$, $f_a = 1/4$) to $1.3 \times 10^6\, M_\odot$ for a steep isothermal cusp with a high accreted mass fraction ($\alpha = 2$, $f_a = 1/2$). $\mathcal{M}_0 = 8.7 \times 10^5\, M_\odot$ for the fiducial parameters we adopt here: a dynamically relaxed cusp[31] where $\alpha = 7/4$, and an intermediate accreted mass fraction $f_a = 3/8$. Note that the agreement

[c]The stellar mass contribution $Q_\star$ to the final BH mass Q is related to the stars-only growth solution $\mathcal{Q}$ by $Q_\star < \mathcal{Q} \leq Q$ for $b < 0$, but by $\mathcal{Q} \leq Q_\star \leq Q$ for $b \geq 0$.

with the observed lower limit on BH masses, $\mathcal{M}_0 \lesssim \min(M_\bullet) \sim 10^6\,M_\odot$, follows from basic local physics (tidal disruption and loss-cone dynamics) and empirical global properties of the universe (a universal M/σ relation and the age of the universe). It is not introduced implicitly by any of the assumptions.

The scatter around the universal M/σ relation is thought to reflect intrinsic physical differences between individual galaxies, which are well beyond the measurement errors (footnote b). Therefore, it induces roughly Gaussian intrinsic probability distributions for $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$: $\mathcal{M}_0 = (1.0 \pm 0.7) \times 10^6\,M_\odot$ and $\mathcal{S}_0 = 75 \pm 29\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}$. The lowest-$\sigma_\star$ galaxies known to harbor AGN[32, 33] (and hence BHs, with roughly estimated masses in the range $10^5 \lesssim M_\bullet \lesssim 10^6\,M_\odot$), have $\sigma_\star \sim 30-40\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}$. This corresponds to the 5% lower C.L. $\mathcal{S}_0 \lesssim 35\,\mathrm{km\,s^{-1}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_0 \lesssim 2 \times 10^5\,M_\odot$, which we adopt here as typical lower mass and velocity dispersion limits for BHs and their host galaxies. Lower mass BHs are rarer yet: an IMBH with mass $\leq 10^4\,M_\odot$ is at the 10^{-4} C.L., and one with mass $\leq 10^3\,M_\odot$ is below the 10^{-6} C.L.

This derivation of a universal minimal mass scale for present-day central BHs rests on four assumptions. (1) Most BH seeds were formed in the early universe, at a look-back time $t_i \sim \mathcal{O}(t_H)$. (2) The growth is typically not mass limited, that is, the growing BH is embedded in a massive-enough system with $M_{\rm sys} \gg M_\bullet$ at all times. (3) The accretion of stars proceeds efficiently[34] ($f_a \gtrsim$ few $\times\, 0.1$) in a relaxed stellar cusp. (4) The boundary conditions at the radius of influence are set by a universal M/σ relation at all times.

The assumption of an early start for BH seeds is plausible given the early appearance of AGN, and since suggested BH seed formation mechanisms typically require the extreme conditions of the early universe[17]. The requirement of enough stellar mass for accretion is also plausible, given that the formation and retention of a BH seed typically require a substantially more massive host system, and given the modest mass scale of $\mathcal{M}_0 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^5\,M_\odot)$. The growth rate of the BH by the accretion of stars in an isolated system, $\mathrm{d}M_\bullet/\mathrm{dt} \sim f_a M_\star N_\star\,/(\log(1/j_{lc})T_R)$ (Eq. A-7), where $M_\star N_\star$ is the stellar mass in the radius of influence and T_R the relaxation time, is by definition slow enough to allow the system to adjust and remain in equilibrium, since the timescale for the BH to grow by order of the stellar mass, $(\mathrm{d}M_\bullet/\mathrm{dt})/(M_\star N_\star)$, is longer by a factor $\log(1/j_{lc})/f_a \gg 1$ than the timescale for the cluster's return to steady state, $T_{SS} \simeq T_R/4$ (Eq. A-3).

The least secure assumption is that a universal M/σ relation holds near its present-day value as the BH grows. However, this is broadly consistent with observations of quasars up to[35, 19] $z \sim 1$, and with simulations of large scale structure evolution up to[36, 37] $z \sim 4$.

BH–BH mergers not only increase the BH mass, but also affect the dynamics of the stellar system around it. Although mergers initially increase the plunge rate by randomizing the orbits and / or by the Kozai resonance[38], on longer timescales they may strongly suppress it by ejecting stars from the radius of influence. Such suppression is not effective around IMBHs, because the return to steady state is fast for $M_\bullet \lesssim 10^5\,M_\odot$, $T_{SS} < \mathcal{O}(10^8\,\mathrm{yr})$ (Eq. A-3)[39, 40]. Additional growth channels thus only increase present day BH masses, and



Figure 1: The growth of the minimal BH mass $\mathcal{M}_z$ from the formation redshift z_i at look-back time t_i, as function of redshift or time (Eq. 4) for 3 values of the BH seed mass, and for 3 seed formation redshifts spanning an order of magnitude in cosmic time (for the universal M/σ relation without scatter, assuming an $\alpha = 7/4$ cusp of Solar type stars and an accreted mass fraction $f_a = 3/8$). The convergence to evolution that is independent of initial mass is rapid in redshift. The earlier the formation, the higher is $\mathcal{M}_0$. The range $z = 0.1 - 10$ of formation redshifts translate to a lower mass limit on present-day MBHs in the range $\mathcal{M}_0 \sim 10^{(5.6\pm0.5)}\ M_\odot$ (gray band).

reinforce the conclusion that galactic nuclei with $M_\bullet < \mathcal{M}_0$ BHs should be rare.

Figure (1) shows the redshift evolution of the lower mass limit $\mathcal{M}_z$, which increases rapidly with decreasing redshift to its present-day value $\mathcal{M}_0$. Present-day IMBHs may exist in recently formed, or in lower-mass systems where growth is supply-limited (e.g. globular clusters with $M < 10^6\ M_\odot$). However, it is not clear whether such low-mass systems can form a BH seed.

Early TDE-driven growth and the suppression of the cosmic BH mass function below $\mathcal{M}_0$ has implications for BH seed evolution, the cosmic rates and properties of TDEs and of GWs from intermediate mass ratio inspiral events (IMRIs). We conclude by listing these briefly.

A high rate of TDEs can allow BH seed growth to continue despite the depletion of gas available for accretion by supernovae feedback[41]. The lack of IMBHs at low redshifts means that electromagnetic searches will have to

reach high redshifts to detect TDEs from an IMBH (jetted TDEs may provide an opportunity[42]). The prospects of detecting exotic processes related to IMBHs, such as a tidal detonation of a white dwarf in the steep tidal field of a low-mass BH[43], will be low. The mean observed rate of TDEs per galaxy, $\Gamma \sim 10^{-5}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\,\mathrm{gal}^{-1}$, is substantially lower than predicted rates[44]. A dearth of BHs below $\mathcal{M}_0$ may resolve, at least in part, the rate discrepancy.

IMBHs produce GWs by IMRIs and by IMBH-IMBH mergers. IMRI detection by planned space-borne GW observatories[8, 45, 46] is limited to $z <$ few $\times\, 0.1$, and is therefore unlikely. In contrast, IMBH mergers can be detected to very high redshifts. A search for GWs from IMBH mergers and IMRIs can reveal the formation history of BH seeds. We predict that BH seeds are driven early on to higher mass by the accretion of stars, and therefore IMBHs are very rare in the present-day universe, but will be found near their high formation redshifts.

Acknowledgments We are grateful for helpful discussions with Y. Alexander, J. Gair, A. Gal-Yam, J. Green, M. MacLeod, N. Neumayer, T. Piran, E. Rossi, A. Sesana, N. Stone and B. Trakhtenbrot. TA acknowledges support by the I-CORE Program of the Planning and Budgeting Committee and The Israel Science Foundation (grant No 1829/12). BB acknowledges support by NASA (grant NNX14AM24G) and by the NSF (grant AST-1406166).

Appendix
Summary of results from loss-cone theory

The tidal disruption (plunge) rate can be approximated by the flux of stars into the BH from from the boundary between the inner region, where stars slowly diffuse into the loss-cone (the empty loss-cone) and the outer region, where stellar scattering is strong enough that the loss-cone is effectively full (the full loss-cone)[21]. The boundary is at a critical radius that satisfies

$$q = \frac{[J_c(a_c)/J_{lc}]^2 P(a_c)}{\log(J_c(ra_c)/J_{lc}) T_R(a_c)} = 1\,, \tag{A-1}$$

where $P = 2\pi\sqrt{a^3/GM_\bullet}$ is the orbital period, $M_\bullet$ is MBH mass, $J_c = \sqrt{GM_\bullet a}$ is the circular angular momentum at a, J_{lc} is angular momentum of the loss-cone ($J_{lc} \simeq \sqrt{2GM_\bullet Q^{1/3} R_\star}$ for tidal disruption, so $J_c/J_{lc} \simeq \sqrt{(a/R_\star)/2Q^{1/3}}$). T_R is the 2-body (non-resonant) relaxation time [40],

$$T_R(a) = \frac{5}{8}\frac{Q^2 P(a)}{N_\star(a)\log Q}\,, \tag{A-2}$$

where $Q = M_\bullet/M_\star$, $N_\star(a) = \mu_h Q (a/r_h)^{3-\alpha}$ is the number of stars enclosed in r and $r_h = \eta_h G M_\bullet/\sigma_\star^2$ is the radius of influence. The numeric prefactors are conventionally assumed to be $\mu_h = 2$ and $\eta_h = 1$.

The time for a galactic nucleus to recover from a perturbation and return to steady state is[40]

$$T_{SS} = T_R(r_h)/4\,. \tag{A-3}$$

The exact solution for the critical radius can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_c = a_c/r_h &= \left(\frac{5}{4}\frac{R_\star c^2}{\mu_h \Lambda_{lc}\eta_h G M_\star}\left(\frac{\sigma}{c}\right)^2 Q^{1/3}\right)^{1/(4-\alpha)} \\ &= \left(A_c s^2\right)^{1/(4-\alpha)} Q^{(1+6/\beta)/(12-3\alpha)}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{A-4}$$

where

$$A_c = \frac{5}{4}\frac{R_\star c^2}{\mu_h \Lambda_{lc}\eta_h G M_\star}\,, \tag{A-5}$$

$$\Lambda_{lc}(Q,a) = \log Q/\log\left(J_c(a)/J_{lc}\right)\,, \tag{A-6}$$

and where the last equality in Eq. (A-4) assumes the M/σ relation $\sigma_\star = (M_\bullet/M_s)^{1/\beta}\,\sigma_s$, in terms of the dimensionless velocity dispersion scale $s = (M_s/M_\star)^{-1/\beta}\,\sigma_s/c$.

When $\delta_c > 1$, the rate is estimated at[47] r_h. The transition occurs above $M_1 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^6\,M_\odot)$, independently of α and almost independently of β. The plunge rate can then be conservatively approximated by the empty loss-cone rate at $a_e = \min(a_c, r_h)$,

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{N_\star(a_e)}{\log(J_c(a_e)/J_{lc})T_R(a_e)} = \frac{8}{5}\frac{\Lambda_{lc}\mu_h^2}{P\left(r_h\right)}\left(\frac{a_e}{r_h}\right)^{(9-4\alpha)/2}\,. \tag{A-7}$$

The actual rate, including the contribution from the full loss-cone regime, can be up to $\times 2$ higher [47].

Defining $r_\star = GM_\star/c^2$ and $t_\star = GM_\star/c^3$, Γ can be represented as

$$\Gamma(\delta_c) = \frac{1}{\pi t_\star}\begin{cases}\gamma_c(Q,a_e)Q^{(2\alpha-15)/6(4-\alpha)}\left(\frac{\sigma_\star}{c}\right)^{7(3-\alpha)/(4-\alpha)} & \delta_c \le 1 \\ \gamma_h(Q,a_e)Q^{-1}\left(\frac{\sigma_\star}{c}\right)^3 & \delta_c > 1\end{cases}\,, \tag{A-8}$$

where

$$\gamma_c(Q,a_e) = \left[\left(\frac{4\Lambda_{lc}}{5}\right)^{2\alpha-1}\left(\frac{\mu_h}{\eta_h^{(3-\alpha)}}\right)^7\left(\frac{R_\star}{r_\star}\right)^{9-4\alpha}\right]^{1/2(4-\alpha)}\,, \tag{A-9}$$

and

$$\gamma_h(Q,a_e) = \frac{4\mu_h^2\Lambda_{lc}}{5\eta_h^{3/2}}\,. \tag{A-10}$$

When σ is given by the M/σ relation, the rate can be expressed as

$$\Gamma\left(\delta_c\right) = \Gamma_\star^\Lambda(Q,\delta_c)Q^{b(\delta_c)}\,, \tag{A-11}$$

where

$$\Gamma_\star^\Lambda(Q,\delta_c) = \frac{1}{\pi t_\star}\begin{cases}\gamma_c(Q,a_e)s^{7(3-\alpha)/(4-\alpha)} & \delta_c \le 1\\ \gamma_h(Q,a_e)s^3 & \delta_c > 1\end{cases}. \tag{A-12}$$

The notation $\Gamma_\star^\Lambda$ denotes the weak functional dependence on Q via the logarithmic term $\Lambda_{lc}(Q,a)$. The power-law index is

$$b(\delta_c) = \begin{cases} b_< = {}^{7(3-\alpha)}\!/_{\beta(4-\alpha)} - {}^{(15/2-\alpha)}\!/_{3(4-\alpha)} & \delta_c \le 1\\ b_> = {}^{3}\!/_{\beta} - 1 & \delta_c > 1\end{cases}. \tag{A-13}$$

For an $n_\star \propto r^{-\alpha}$ steady state stellar density cusp [31] with $\alpha = 7/4$, the power-law index is

$$b(\alpha = 7/4) = \begin{cases}(105-23\beta)/27\beta & M_\bullet \le M_c\\ 3/\beta - 1 & M_\bullet > M_c\end{cases}. \tag{A-14}$$

Note that $b \ll 1$ for the empirically-determined range of the M/σ relation index[6, 15], $4 \lesssim \beta < 6$.

It is useful to approximate the rate as a true power-law in order to apply the analytic solution for the growth equation (Eq. 2). This can be done by choosing a fixed typical value for the logarithmic term, and then

$$\Gamma(\delta_c) \simeq \Gamma_\star(\delta_c) Q^{b(\delta_c)}\,, \tag{A-15}$$

where the normalization $\Gamma_\star$ is not a function of Q. Averaging the logarithmic term over $Q = 10^3$ to 10^7 for $\alpha = 7/4$, $\mu_h = 2$ $\eta_h = 1$ and $\beta = 5$, and normalizing the M/σ relation by requiring that the radius of influence satisfy

$$r_0 = r_h(Q_0) = GM_s^{2/\beta}(Q_0 M_\star)^{1-2/\beta}/\sigma_s^2\,, \tag{A-16}$$

(for the universal M/σ relation[5], $r_0 \simeq 0.79\,\mathrm{pc}$ for $Q_0 = 10^6$ and $M_\star = 1\,M_\odot$) yields a constant $B_c \simeq 0.7$ such that

$$\delta_c \simeq B_c\left[\frac{5}{4\mu_h}\frac{R_\star}{r_0}Q_0^{1-2/\beta}\right]^{1/(4-\alpha)} Q^{(6+\beta)/3\beta(4-\alpha)}\,. \tag{A-17}$$

The value of Q where $\delta_c = 1$ is then

$$Q_c = B_c^{3\beta(\alpha-4)/(6+\beta)}\left[\frac{4\mu_h}{5}\frac{r_0}{R_\star}Q_0^{2/\beta-1}\right]^{3\beta/(6+\beta)}. \tag{A-18}$$

Similarly, the logarithmically-averaged plunge rate can be approximated with a constant $B_p \simeq 2.25$ and expressed by the normalization

$$\Gamma_\star(\delta_c) = \frac{\gamma_p}{\pi t_\star}\begin{cases}1 & \delta_c \le 1\,,\ (Q \le Q_c)\\ Q_c^{b_<-b_>} & \delta_c > 1\,,\ (Q > Q_c)\end{cases}, \tag{A-19}$$



Figure 2: Examples of the exact plunge rate (Eq. A-7) as function of the BH mass $M_\bullet$ or $\sigma_\star$ (for a $\beta = 5$ M/σ relation), compared to the power-law approximation (Eq. A-15), for $M_\star = 1\,M_\odot$, $R_\star = 1\,R_\odot$, $f_a = 3/8$, $\alpha = 7/4$ and $\beta = 4,\,5$, normalized to $r_h(10^6\,M_\odot) = 0.79\,\mathrm{pc}$ and $N_\star(r_h) = 2Q$. The two match quite well. The maximal steady state stellar accretion rate that is consistent with the mass of the BH, $\max\Gamma = M_\bullet/(M_\star f_a t_H)$ is compared to the plunge rates. This simple linear estimate already indicates that BH growth by the accretion of stars is important for low mass MBHs [23, 24], and is inconsistent (too fast) for BHs with present-day mass $M_\bullet \lesssim 5\times10^5\,M_\odot$, which should have grown above their assumed mass. Radiation back-reaction above the Eddington limit L_E by the accretion luminosity $L_{TD} = \eta f_a M_\star c^2\Gamma$ ($\eta = 0.1$ assumed for the radiative efficiency) is only relevant for the lower BH masses, for some values of the M/σ relation, where it may slow down the initial BH growth. For example, for $\beta = 5$, $L_{TD}/L_E \sim 6$ at $M_\bullet = 10^3\,M_\odot$, but falls below $L_{TD}/L_E = 1$ for $M_\bullet > 5\times10^3\,M_\odot$.

where

$$\gamma_p \simeq B_p B_c^{(9/2-2\alpha)}\left(\frac{r_\star}{R_\star}\right)^{3/2}\times \left[\left(\frac{4}{5}\right)^{2\alpha-1}\mu_h^7\left(\frac{R_\star}{r_0}Q_0^{1-2/\beta}\right)^{7(3-\alpha)}\right]^{1/2(4-\alpha)}. \qquad \text{(A-20)}$$

Note that $b(\delta_c) < 1$ over the range of interest (cf Eq. A-14), and therefore the sub-exponential growth solution (Eq. 4) is the relevant one.

Figure (2) shows the TDE rates in the two dynamical regimes $a_c \lessgtr r_h$ ($Q \lessgtr Q_c$). At the lower mass end, the mean mass accretion rate may rise above the Eddington rate. Depending on the exact value of the logarithmic slope of the M/σ relation, β, the TDE rate on the low-mass branch, can either rise or fall with $M_\bullet$.

References

[1] Miller, M. C. & Colbert, E. J. M. Intermediate-Mass Black Holes. *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **13**, 1–64 (2004). `arXiv:astro-ph/0308402`.

[2] Ferrarese, L. & Merritt, D. A Fundamental Relation between Supermassive Black Holes and Their Host Galaxies. *Astrophys. J.* **539**, L9–L12 (2000).

[3] Gebhardt, K. *et al.* A Relationship between Nuclear Black Hole Mass and Galaxy Velocity Dispersion. *Astrophys. J.* **539**, L13–L16 (2000).

[4] McConnell, N. J. & Ma, C.-P. Revisiting the Scaling Relations of Black Hole Masses and Host Galaxy Properties. *Astrophys. J.* **764**, 184 (2013). `1211.2816`.

[5] van den Bosch, R. C. E. Unification of the fundamental plane and Super Massive Black Hole Masses. *Astrophys. J.* **831**, 134 (2016). `1606.01246`.

[6] Graham, A. W. Galaxy Bulges and Their Massive Black Holes: A Review. In Laurikainen, E., Peletier, R. & Gadotti, D. (eds.) *Galaxy Bulges*, vol. 418 of *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, 263–313 (Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2016). `1501.02937`.

[7] Rees, M. J. Tidal disruption of stars by black holes of 10 to the 6th-10 to the 8th solar masses in nearby galaxies. *Nature* **333**, 523–528 (1988).

[8] Amaro-Seoane, P. *et al.* eLISA: Astrophysics and cosmology in the millihertz regime. *GW Notes, Vol. 6, p. 4-110* **6**, 4–110 (2013). `1201.3621`.

[9] Abbott, B. P. *et al.* Observation of gravitational waves from a binary black hole merger. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).

[10] Wyller, A. A. Observational Aspects of Black Holes in Globular Clusters. *Astrophys. J.* **160**, 443 (1970).

[11] Lynden-Bell, D. Galactic Nuclei as Collapsed Old Quasars. *Nature* **223**, 690–694 (1969).

[12] Shankar, F. *et al.* Selection bias in dynamically measured supermassive black hole samples: its consequences and the quest for the most fundamental relation. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **460**, 3119–3142 (2016). 1603.01276.

[13] Soltan, A. Masses of quasars. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **200**, 115–122 (1982).

[14] Yu, Q. & Tremaine, S. Observational constraints on growth of massive black holes. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **335**, 965–976 (2002). astro-ph/0203082.

[15] Kormendy, J. & Ho, L. C. Coevolution (Or Not) of Supermassive Black Holes and Host Galaxies. *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **51**, 511–653 (2013). 1304.7762.

[16] Mortlock, D. J. *et al.* A luminous quasar at a redshift of z = 7.085. *Nature* **474**, 616–619 (2011). 1106.6088.

[17] Volonteri, M. The Formation and Evolution of Massive Black Holes. *Science* **337**, 544 (2012). 1208.1106.

[18] Bennett, C. L., Larson, D., Weiland, J. L. & Hinshaw, G. The 1% Concordance Hubble Constant. *Astrophys. J.* **794**, 135 (2014). 1406.1718.

[19] Shen, Y. *et al.* The Sloan Digital Sky Survey Reverberation Mapping Project: No Evidence for Evolution in the $M_\bullet - \sigma_*$ Relation to $z \sim 1$. *Astrophys. J.* **805**, 96 (2015). 1502.01034.

[20] Alexander, T. Key Questions about Galactic Center Dynamics. In Morris, M. R., Wang, Q. D. & Yuan, F. (eds.) *The Galactic Center: a Window to the Nuclear Environment of Disk Galaxies*, vol. 439 of *ASP Conf. Ser*, 129 (2011). 1007.4991.

[21] Lightman, A. P. & Shapiro, S. L. The distribution and consumption rate of stars around a massive, collapsed object. *Astrophys. J.* **211**, 244–262 (1977).

[22] Bar-Or, B. & Alexander, T. Steady-state Relativistic Stellar Dynamics Around a Massive Black hole. *Astrophys. J.* **820**, 129 (2016). 1508.01390.

[23] Murphy, B. W., Cohn, H. N. & Durisen, R. H. Dynamical and luminosity evolution of active galactic nuclei - Models with a mass spectrum. *Astrophys. J.* **370**, 60–77 (1991).

[24] Freitag, M. & Benz, W. A new Monte Carlo code for star cluster simulations. II. Central black hole and stellar collisions. *Astron. Astrophys.* **394**, 345–374 (2002).

[25] Stone, N. C., Kuepper, A. H. W. & Ostriker, J. P. Formation of Massive Black Holes in Galactic Nuclei: Runaway Tidal Encounters. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). 1606.01909.

[26] Merritt, D. *Dynamics and Evolution of Galactic Nuclei* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

[27] Ayal, S., Livio, M. & Piran, T. Tidal Disruption of a Solar-Type Star by a Supermassive Black Hole. *Astrophys. J.* **545**, 772–780 (2000).

[28] Hoyle, F. & Lyttleton, R. A. The effect of interstellar matter on climatic variation. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **35**, 405 (1939).

[29] Bondi, H. On spherically symmetrical accretion. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **112**, 195–+ (1952).

[30] Alexander, T. & Natarajan, P. Rapid growth of seed black holes in the early universe by supra-exponential accretion. *Science* **345**, 1330–1333 (2014). 1408.1718.

[31] Bahcall, J. N. & Wolf, R. A. Star distribution around a massive black hole in a globular cluster. *Astrophys. J.* **209**, 214–232 (1976).

[32] Xiao, T. *et al.* Exploring the Low-mass End of the M $_{BH}$-σ_* Relation with Active Galaxies. *Astrophys. J.* **739**, 28 (2011). 1106.6232.

[33] Neumayer, N. & Walcher, C. J. Are Nuclear Star Clusters the Precursors of Massive Black Holes? *Advances in Astronomy* **2012**, 709038 (2012). 1201.4950.

[34] Krolik, J., Piran, T., Svirski, G. & Cheng, R. M. ASASSN-14li: A Model Tidal Disruption Event. *Astrophys. J.* **827**, 127 (2016). 1602.02824.

[35] Salviander, S. & Shields, G. A. The Black Hole Mass-Stellar Velocity Dispersion Relationship for Quasars in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7. *Astrophys. J.* **764**, 80 (2013). 1210.7263.

[36] Sijacki, D. *et al.* The Illustris simulation: the evolving population of black holes across cosmic time. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **452**, 575–596 (2015). 1408.6842.

[37] Taylor, P. & Kobayashi, C. Time evolution of galaxy scaling relations in cosmological simulations. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **463**, 2465–2479 (2016). 1608.06685.

[38] Chen, X., Sesana, A., Madau, P. & Liu, F. K. Tidal Stellar Disruptions by Massive Black Hole Pairs. II. Decaying Binaries. *Astrophys. J.* **729**, 13 (2011). 1012.4466.

[39] Preto, M. & Amaro-Seoane, P. On Strong Mass Segregation Around a Massive Black Hole: Implications for Lower-Frequency Gravitational-Wave Astrophysics. *Astrophys. J.* **708**, L42–L46 (2010). 0910.3206.

[40] Bar-Or, B., Kupi, G. & Alexander, T. Stellar Energy Relaxation around a Massive Black Hole. *Astrophys. J.* **764**, 52 (2013). 1209.4594.

[41] Dubois, Y. *et al.* Black hole evolution - I. Supernova-regulated black hole growth. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **452**, 1502–1518 (2015). 1504.00018.

[42] Fialkov, A. & Loeb, A. Jetted Tidal Disruptions of Stars as a Flag of Intermediate Mass Black Holes at High Redshifts. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). 1611.01386.

[43] Rosswog, S., Ramirez-Ruiz, E. & Hix, W. R. Tidal Disruption and Ignition of White Dwarfs by Moderately Massive Black Holes. *Astrophys. J.* **695**, 404–419 (2009). 0808.2143.

[44] Stone, N. C. & Metzger, B. D. Rates of stellar tidal disruption as probes of the supermassive black hole mass function. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **455**, 859–883 (2016). 1410.7772.

[45] Yagi, K. Scientific Potential of Decigo Pathfinder and Testing GR with Space-Borne Gravitational Wave Interferometers. *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **22**, 1341013 (2013). 1302.2388.

[46] Gong, X. *et al.* Descope of the ALIA mission. *Journal of Physics Conference Series* **610**, 012011 (2015). 1410.7296.

[47] Syer, D. & Ulmer, A. Tidal disruption rates of stars in observed galaxies. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **306**, 35–42 (1999).